Name \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Comments** |
| **Grammar/**  **Spelling** | Excellent- Author uses active voice, consistent use of tenses, minimal, 1 or 2 at most spelling errors. Sophisticated language is used.  Weak papers- use passive voices leading to wordy sentences. At best spellcheck is used. Often uses slang or colloquialisms |
| **Structure (transitions, I references, Non-Sequiturs et.al)** | Excellent- Paper seamlessly leads from one topic to another. Transitions are used to link ideas. One idea builds upon another to lead to a clear synthesis. No personal references or rhetorical questions  Weak Papers- Have unclear organization, regularly uses personal pronouns. Ideas come out of the blue (non-sequitor) and are not clearly linked to prior ideas. |
| **Introductory**  **Paragraph and Thesis.** | Excellent- Introductory paragraph sets for the basic ideas in the paper including the thesis. The thesis is clear and while the introduction doesn’t go into detail how it will be proved , the into paragraph develops the organization of the paper so that the reader can anticipate what types of proofs will be developed by the author. Thesis stays within the time period  Weak Papers- Bounce from too much detail to overly superficial in the same paragraph and have a minimal thesis (if any thesis). |
| **Facts (Accuracy/Scope/**  **Relevancy) and Organization** | Excellent- accurate and cogent facts. The author has successfully used facts that are clearly related to the issue at hand and have both depth and scope. No extraneous facts. All facts bear on the subject matter and are intended to explain the authors point and help develop the issues in their thesis. Paper is well cited, evidencing that all facts are supported.  Weak papers- facts are often unrelated to the thesis or it’s not clear what point the author is making. Little or no context is provided for people, events or ideas. Lots of facts but not working towards advancing thesis. Facts are mentioned but without cites to provide any support. |
| **Analysis**  **Paraphrasing?** | Excellent- few to no quotes are used, if a quote is used it’s short and makes a clear point. Author regularly paraphrases material so that it remains accurate but uses language to support the thesis. Points are raised that refute the thesis and the author develops factually based responses that likewise paraphrase information. Author understands the strength of the sources used and uses them to advance their argument. |
| **Conclusion** | Excellent- Powerfully recaps the major points of the paper using conclusory terms to advance the thesis and reject alternative views.  Weak- simply restates first paragraph. |
| **In Text Cites**  **And Works cited and conclusion page** | Excellent- all material is properly cited, including page numbers for books. All material is clearly available through noodletools cards to confirm information. Author uses MLA citation, works cited and consulted format set forth by library.  Weak- Cites do not have adequate information to locate info.. Cite and consultation pages are inconsistent with library requirements. |
| **Strength of sources** | Excellent -Multiple sources are used that generate depth of information. Sources provide a richness and detail that advances the thesis. Books and other more in depth material is used to master the subject matter  Weak- Sources used are largely duplicative of each other, ie. FactsonFile, History.net, Britannica. Sources of questionable value (ie. No clear author, publisher of dubious value)…Note: If you can’t explain how it’s more reliable than Wikipedia you shouldn’t be using it. |